

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

0009/011

AUG 24 2007

Application Serial No. 10/666,883

REMARKS

1. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the Examiner's comments which have greatly assisted Applicant in responding.

2. **35 U.S.C. §102**

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). MPEP § 2131, emphasis added.

Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Call (US Patent No. 6,154,738).

Claims 5, 11, 18 and 24: The Examiner relies on Call, col. 6, lines 15-55 as "suggesting" the subject matter of claims 5, 11, 18 and 24: verifying "said resource information request before returning the retrieved resource information." Applicant respectfully disagrees. The cited teaching describes operation of the registration handler and the mechanisms provided for insuring that a registrant has the authority to create and alter the information in a supplier record. Thus, the cited teaching describes security measures designed to prevent unauthorized persons from publishing information or altering previously published information. The claims, in stark contrast, have nothing to do with publishing information; they are directed to verifying requests for published information. Because the cited teaching from Call has nothing to do with verifying requests for published information, it is incorrect that the cited teaching "suggests" the subject matter of claims 5, 11, 18 and 24.

Even if it were correct that the cited teaching "suggested" the subject matter of claims 5, 11, 18 and 24, a finding of anticipation requires something

Application Serial No. 10/666,883

more than mere "suggestion." As above, the prior art must describe each and every element as set forth in the claim, and the identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as in the claim. As above, the cited portion of Call describes the security procedures provided to prevent unauthorized parties from publishing information or altering published information. It has nothing to do with verifying requests for published information. Accordingly, the prior art does not describe each and every element as set forth in the claim, nor is the identical invention shown in the same level of detail as in the claim. The present rejection is therefore improper. Claims 5, 11, 18 and 24 are therefore allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Claims 1, 8, 14 and 21 are amended to incorporate the subject matter of claims 5, 11, 18 and 24, and are therefore deemed allowable. Claims 5, 11, 18 and 24 are cancelled from the Application.

In view of their dependence from allowable parent claims, the dependent claims are deemed allowable without any separate consideration of their merits.

3. No new matter is added by way of the above amendments. It should be appreciated that Applicant has elected to amend the Claims solely for the purpose of expediting the patent application process. Such amendments do not indicate agreement with the Examiner's position, nor are they evidence of intent to sacrifice claim scope. Applicant expressly reserves the right to pursue protection of a scope that it reasonably believes it is entitled to, in one or more future submissions to the USPTO.

4. For the record, Applicant respectfully traverses any and all factual assertions in the file that are not supported by documentary evidence. Such include assertions based on findings of inherency, assertions based on official notice, and any other assertions of what is well known or commonly known in the prior art.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER 011/011

AUG 24 2007

Application Serial No. 10/666,883

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, the Application is deemed in allowable condition. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the Application, he is invited to contact Applicant's attorney at 650-474-8400.

Respectfully submitted,


Michael A. Glenn
Reg. No. 30,176

Customer No. 22862